

REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Krancher, Seeker, Lee

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9-11, 23, 24, 26-28, and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,799,237 issued to Krancher et al. (hereinafter "Krancher"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,757 issued to Seeker et al. (hereinafter "Seeker"), and in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,275,109 issued to Lee (hereinafter "Lee"). Without admitting that these references could or should be combined, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over Krancher, Seeker, and Lee.

Claim 10 recites:

"A method, comprising:

monitoring for communication of trusted data cycles on a bus with a secured docking logic of a computer system, the secured docking logic coupled between the bus and a docking connector;

detecting each of the trusted data cycles by detecting a same predefined trusted data cycle indicator at the beginning of each of the trusted data cycles with the secured docking logic; and

preventing the trusted data cycles that each begin with the same predefined trusted data cycle indicator from being available to a component external to the computer system with the secured docking logic".

As understood by Applicants, Krancher, Seeker, and Lee do not disclose these limitations or render them obvious. In particular, as understood by Applicants, Krancher, Seeker, and Lee do not disclose or render obvious either: (1) "*monitoring for communication of trusted data cycles on a bus with a secured docking logic of a computer system, the secured docking logic coupled between the bus and a docking connector*"; or (2) "*detecting each of the trusted data cycles by detecting a same predefined trusted data cycle indicator at the beginning of each of the trusted*

data cycles with the secured docking logic; and preventing the trusted data cycles that each begin with the same predefined trusted data cycle indicator from being available to a component external to the computer system with the secured docking logic."

Krancher discusses identifying and synchronizing incompatibilities between a portable computer and a docking station. See e.g., the Title. Compatibility is different than security/trust. Accordingly, Krancher does not disclose or render obvious the "secured docking logic" recited in claim 10.

The Examiner has already acknowledged that "*Krancher does not expressively mention a secured docking circuit to scan for the trusted data cycle.*" See e.g., the bottom of page 2 of the Office Action. Accordingly, Krancher does not disclose or render obvious the "*same predefined trusted data cycle indicator*" recited in claim 10.

Seeker discusses in part a secure computer with a bus monitoring system and methods. See e.g., the Title. FIG. 1 of Seeker shows a secure computer system 100 that includes a bus access monitor 200.

However, Seeker does not disclose or render obvious "*monitoring for communication of trusted data cycles on a bus with a secured docking logic of a computer system, the secured docking logic coupled between the bus and a docking connector.*" In fact, Seeker does not even discuss a docking connector, even use the word "*docking*." Accordingly, Seeker cannot possibly disclose the claimed "secured docking logic" that is "*coupled between the bus and a docking connector.*"

Moreover, Seeker does not disclose or render obvious "*detecting each of the trusted data cycles by detecting a same predefined trusted data cycle indicator at the beginning of each of the trusted data cycles with the secured docking logic; and preventing the trusted data cycles that each*

begin with the same predefined trusted data cycle indicator from being available to a component external to the computer system with the secured docking logic."

This does not appear to be in dispute, since the Examiner has already acknowledged that "Krancher and Seeker do not expressively mention detect trusted data cycle by detecting a predefined trusted data cycle indicator value." See e.g., the bottom of page 3 of the Office Action. Moreover, the Examiner has also already acknowledged that "Krancher and Seeker do not expressively mention a same predefined trusted data cycle indicator at a beginning of each of the trusted data cycles." See e.g., the middle of page 6 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully agree, for the reasons previously presented in the last Office Action.

Turning now to Lee. Lee discusses network communication authentication. See e.g., the Title.

However, Lee does not disclose or render obvious "monitoring for communication of trusted data cycles on a bus with a secured docking logic of a computer system, the secured docking logic coupled between the bus and a docking connector". In fact, Lee does not even discuss a docking connector, even use the word "docking." Accordingly, Lee cannot possibly disclose the claimed "secured docking logic" that is "coupled between the bus and a docking connector."

Moreover, Lee does not disclose or render obvious "detecting each of the trusted data cycles by detecting a same predefined trusted data cycle indicator at the beginning of each of the trusted data cycles with the secured docking logic; and preventing the trusted data cycles that each begin with the same predefined trusted data cycle indicator from being available to a component external to the computer system with the secured docking logic."

The Examiner appears to have relied upon "Figs. 3, 4, *authenticated-command bit 31, information/command 34, 42, 44, col. 6 lines 8-9, 25-31*" of Lee. See e.g., the middle of page 6 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that this disclosure in Lee is insufficient to reject the aforementioned limitations in claim 10. Column 6, lines 6-14 of Lee disclose:

"The server 20 is further configured to send authentication transmissions (emphasis added) in a format 30 shown generally in FIG. 3. The format 30 includes the authenticated-command bit 31, the information/command 34 to be processed/implemented by the phone 14, a range 32 of DSP code addresses 26, the up-counter value 36, and the hash result 38 determined by applying the hash algorithm to the code values 28 corresponding to the range 32 of addresses 26, the information/command 34, and the up-counter value 36."

Column 6, lines 24-31 of Lee disclose:

"An exemplary authentication transmission 40 (emphasis added) is shown in FIG. 4. The values shown are for illustrative purposes only, and are not necessarily of, e.g., lengths, that would typically be used. As shown, the range 42 of DSP code addresses is 3A-55, indicating the 58th through the 85th code addresses. In this example, the binary value of the information/command is 0010, and the up-counter value is 1010 (i.e., 10 in decimal)."

Firstly, these sections of Lee make it clear that the format 30 shown generally in FIG. 3 is sent. Likewise, the transmission 40 in FIG. 4 is sent or transmitted. This is entirely different than what is claimed in claim 10, namely *"preventing the trusted data cycles that each begin with the same predefined trusted data cycle indicator from being available to a component external to the computer system with the secured docking logic."*

Secondly, the format 30 shown generally in FIG. 3 and the transmission 40 shown in FIG. 4 are not *"a same predefined trusted data cycle indicator at the beginning of each of the trusted data cycles."* The information/command 34, the range 32 of DSP code addresses 26, the up-counter value 36, and the hash result 38 are variable and are not the same for each transmission.

For at least one or more of these reasons, claim 10 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable over Seeker, Krancher, and Lee.

Claim 1 recites:

"A computer system, comprising:

a chipset;

an internal component of the computer system;

a bus coupled to the chipset to communicate a trusted data cycle to the internal component of the computer system;

a docking connector; and

a secured docking circuit coupled to the bus and coupled between the bus and the docking connector to scan for the trusted data cycle, detect the trusted data cycle by detecting a predefined trusted data cycle indicator value, and provide a filtering mechanism to prevent the trusted data cycle from being provided to a device external to the computer system through the docking connector".

Accordingly, claim 1, and its dependent claims, are believed to be allowable over Krancher, Seeker, and Lee for one or more reasons similar to those discussed above.

Claim 7 recites:

"A circuit, comprising:

a Low Pin Count (LPC) bus; and

filtering means for scanning for trusted data cycles that each include a predefined trusted data cycle indicator value on the Low Pin Count (LPC) bus and preventing the trusted data cycles that each include the predefined trusted data cycle indicator value on the Low Pin Count (LPC) bus from being accessed by an unauthorized component coupled to a docking connector, wherein the filtering means is between the Low Pin Count (LPC) bus and the docking connector."

Accordingly, claim 7, and its dependent claims, are believed to be allowable over Krancher, Seeker, and Lee for one or more reasons similar to those discussed above.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Krancher, Seeker, Lee, Strongin

Claims 3-6, 12-19, 29-32, and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Krancher, in view of Seeker, in view of Lee, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,317 issued to Strongin et al. (hereinafter "Strongin"). Without admitting that these

references could or should be combined, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over Krancher, Seeker, Lee, and Strongin.

Claim 29 recites:

"A system comprising:

a chipset;

a first internal component to provide at least one hardware cryptographic functionality selected from hardware protected storage, platform binding, and platform authentication;

a second internal component to provide a trusted input capability from a keyboard;

a bus coupled to the chipset, coupled to the first internal component, and coupled to the second internal component, the bus to communicate a trusted data cycle from the chipset to the first internal component, the trusted data cycle having a predefined trusted data cycle indicator;

a docking connector; and

secured docking logic coupled between the bus and the docking connector, the secured docking logic to block the trusted data cycle having the predefined trusted data cycle indicator from an external device coupled with the docking connector."

As discussed above, Krancher, Seeker, and Lee do not disclose these limitations or render them obvious. Applicants respectfully submit that Strongin does not remedy all of what is missing from these other references and/or the Examiner has not articulated sufficiently where all of these missing limitations are found in Strongin.

Accordingly, claim 29, and its dependent claims, are believed to be allowable over Krancher, Seeker, Lee, and Strongin.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Krancher, Seeker, Lee, Strongin, Probst

Claims 20-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Krancher, in view of Seeker, and in view of Lee, in view of Strongin, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,982,899 issued to Probst (hereinafter "Probst").

Claims 20-22 depend from, and includes all of the limitations of, independent claim 10. As discussed above, Krancher, Seeker and Lee do not disclose or render obvious the limitations of claim 10. As understood by Applicants, Strongin and Probst do not remedy all of what is missing from these references and/or the Examiner does not appear to have relied upon Strongin and Probst as disclosing all of these limitations and articulated where all of these missing limitations could or would be found in Strongin and Probst. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 10 is believed to be allowable over Krancher, Seeker, Lee, Strongin and Probst. Dependent claims 20-22 are believed to be allowable for at least this reason, as well as for the recitations set forth in each of these dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Krancher, Seeker, Lee, Yanagisawa

Claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Krancher, in view of Seeker, and in view of Lee, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,519, 669 issued to Yanagisawa (hereinafter "Yanagisawa").

Claim 25 depends from, and includes all of the limitations of, independent claim 1. As discussed above, Krancher, Seeker and Lee do not disclose or render obvious the limitations of claim 1. As understood by Applicants, Yanagisawa does not remedy all of what is missing from these references and/or the Examiner does not appear to have relied upon Yanagisawa as disclosing all of these limitations and articulated where all of these missing limitations could or would be found in Yanagisawa. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Krancher, Seeker, Lee, and Yanagisawa. Dependent claim 25 is believed to be allowable for at least this reason, as well as for the recitations set forth in this dependent claim.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 12 2010

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the cited art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed at the earliest possible date.

Request For Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call Brent E. Vecchia at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request For An Extension Of Time

The Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

Charge Our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 2/12/10

By Brent E. Vecchia
Brent E. Vecchia, Reg. No. 48,011
Tel.: (303) 740-1980 (Mountain Time)

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040

App. No. 10/643,678
BEV/srs

- 14 -

Dkt. No. 42P16632